On Jun 19, 2018 Alxleotold Gordon was sentence to 300 months for a violation of 21 USC \$841(a)(1), \$841(b)(1)(C) "Distribution of a controlled substance;" death resulting Ct2S; "Possession of a controlled substance with

18 U.S.C. \$3582(c)(2) Pro-Se Motion AMENDMENT 782 Drug + 2

Amedment 782 reduced the base offense level by **two** levels for most drugs offenses. **Huges v. United States,** 584 U.S. 675 (2018). See **\$2D1.1(C)(15)**(assigning a base offense level of 10 for **(No Drugs).**

intent to distribute" CT4S. No Drugs in CT2S or CT4S. (See Indictment).

Alxleotold Gordon argues that allowing the jdge to find a defendant responsible fo the maximum quantity of drugs that can plausibly be found could result in defendant receiving excessive sentences based on a finding of quantity that is more likely than not excessive. Such a result will violate Alxleotold Gordon due process rights (as in this case). See Townsend v. Burke, 334 U.S. 736 (1948)(Sentence may not be based on materially false information).

PRESENTENCE REPORT

Alxheotold Gordon argues that the federal rules require the court to hold a hearing to determine disputed issues of fact included in the Presentence Report if it wishes to rely upon these facts in sentencing. Fed.R.Crim.P. 32(c)(3)(D). The purpose of this hearing though, is to ensure merely that the information relied upon is not materially false. Determining that information is not materially false does not require any type of heightened scrutiny. It is enough that the sentencing judge is convinced that the disputed facts, as

alleged, is true. While this result in an underestimation of the quantity of drugs involved. It is nonetheless Constitutionally required to prevent excessive sentences. See United States v. Walton, 908 F. 22d 1289 (6th Cir. 1990) (when choosing between a number of plausible estimates of drug quantity, none of which is more likely than not the correct quantity, a court must err on the side of caution). See United States v. Whelan, 396 F.App'X 197 (6th Cir. 2010) (erring on the site of caution)

EVIDENCE

Alxleotold Gordon argues that it was the government burden at sentencing to establish the quantity of drugs involved in the offense by a preponderance of evidence. See United States v. Rusell, 545 F. 3d 633 (6th Cir. 2010). Alxleotold Gordon argues that the district judge calculate hi base offense level using its own amounts of drugs amounts, without explaining its reasons for doing so, and thereby increased Alxleotold Gordon sentence. Such hidden judicial fact-finding has devastating consequences for the actual and perceived fairness of our criminal justice system. See Rosales-Mireles v. United States, 138 S.Ct. 1847 (2018)(regardless of its ultimate reasonableness, a sentence that lacks reliability of unjust procedures may well undermine public perception of the proceedings.

GUESSWORK

Alxleotold Gordon argues that the need to **estimate drug quantities** at times is **not** a license to calculate drug quantities by guesswork. See **United States v. Richards**, 27 F. 3d 465 (10th Cir. 1994).

Estimates of drug quantities are not necessarily forbidden. Alxleotold Gordon argues that the estimates must, have some basics of support in the facts of the particular case. See United States V. Garcia, 994 F. 2d 1499 (10th Cir. 1993). The estimates must, have some basis of support in the facts of the case. When choosing between a number of pausible estimates of drug quantity, none of which is more likely than not the correct quantity, the judge must err on the site of caution. Alxleotold Gordon argues that the sentencing commission clearly expressed its intent that unreliable allegations shall not be considered. §6A1.3.

Alxheotold Gordon has a due process right not to be sentenced on the basis of materially incorrect information. United States v. Tucker, 404 U.S. 443 (1972). Alexheotold Gordon argues that some minimal indication of reliability must accompany a hearsay statement, other than mere allegation, before it may be relied upon in sentencing. United States v. Beauliey, 843 F. 2d 1177 (10th Cir. 1990).

Alxleotold Gordon argues that there is only one transaction date in the indictment. (See Indictment). The district judge evidently believed that because of the Presentence Report (PSR) provided reliable information, he could rely on it regarding the quantity of drugs distributed without any independent corroboration. This is contrary to the sentencing commission's intent expressed in the commentary to \$6A1.3. The district judge's finding that Alxleotold Gordon is responsible for any drugs is clearly erroneous.

Alxleotold Gordon argues that recognition of the need to **estimate drug** quantities at times is **not** a license to calculate drug quantities **by gesswork.**See **United States v. Paulino,** 996 F. 2d 1541 (3d Cir. 1993).

SENTENCING

Alxleotold Gordon argues that in calculating a defendant's base offense level under the sentencing guidelines, the sentencing judge must consider types and quantities of drugs not specified in the counts of conviction but that were part of the same course of conduct or common scheme or plan as the convicted offense. \$1B1.3(a)(2).

Alxleotold Gordon argues that any act used to enhance a defendant's sentence must be part of the same course of conduct or common scheme or plan as the offense of conviction. \$1B1.3(a)(2). Section 1B1.3(a)(2) should not be applied to offenses that are of the same kind, but not encompassed in the same course of conduct or plan as the convicted offenses. The sentencing court are thus required to explicitly state and support, either at the sentencing hearing or (preferably) in a written statement of reasons, the finding that the unconvicted activities bore the necessary relation to the convicted offense.

BURDENS OF PROOF "PROSECUTION"

Alxleontold Gordon argues that the government bears the burden of establishing the quantity of drugs by a preponderance of evidence.

REASON FOR AMENDMENT 782 THE PERTINENT GUIDELINES AND POLICY STATEMENT

The sentencing commission, itself, expressly stated that the purpose of amendment 782 was to change how the applicable statutory minimum penalties are incorporated into the drug quantity table while maintaining consistency with such penalties, and that it served this purpose by reducing by two levels the offense levels assigned to the quantities that trigger the statutory mandatory minimum penalties, resulting in corresponding guideline ranges that include the mandatory minimum penalties. United States Sentencing Commission. Federal Sentencing Guidelines Manual. Vol.3, Amendment 782. Reason for Amendment.

As the sentencing commission explained, more fully, this amendment changes how the applicable Statutory Mandatory Minimum penalties are incorporated into the Drug Quantity Table while maintaining consistency with such penalties. See 28 USC \$994(b)(1) (providing that each sentencing range must be consistent with all pertinent provisions of title 18, United States Code); See also 28 USC \$994(a) (providing that the commission shall promulgate guidelines and policy statements consistent with all pertinent provisions of any federal statute).

Alxleotold Gordon knows that amendment 782 **does** absolutely **nothing** to reduce the drug quantity that triggers a mandatory minimum.

EXAMPLE

The amendment reduces by two levels the offense levels assigned to the quantities that trigger the statutory mandatory minimum penalties, resulting in corresponding guideline ranges that include the mandatory minimum penalties. Offenses involving drug quantities that trigger a five years statutory minimum are assigned a base level of 24 (51-63) months a criminal History category 1, which includes the five-year (60 month) statutory minimum for such offenses, and offenses involving drug quantities that trigger a ten-year statutory minimum are assigned a base offense level of 30 (97-121 months of criminal history category 1, which includes ten-years (120 months) statutory minimum for such offenses. Offense levels for quantities above and below the mandatory minimum threshold quantities similarly are adjusted downward by two levels, except that the minimum base offense level of 6 and the maximum base offense level of 38 for most drug types is retained, as are

previously existing minimum and maximum base offense levels for particular drug types. United States Sentencing Commission, Federal Sentencing Guidelines Manual, Vol.3. Amendment 782. Reason for Amendment.

NON-DELEGATION AND SEPARATION-OF-POWER "ULTRA VIVES"

Unauthorized: beyond the scope of power allowed or granted. See Blak's Law Dictionary. See Mistretta v. United States, 488 U.S. 361 (1989).

Alxleotold Gordon argues that the **integrity** and the maintenance of the system of government ordained by the Constitution mandate that Congress **cannot delegate** its legislative power to another Branch. 488 U.S. at 371-72; **Field v. Clark,** 143 U.S. 649 (1892).

RELIEF REQUEST

To GRANT my Pro-Se \$3582(c)(2) Amendment 782 Drug + 2 Motion to Rase Level 6, 0-6 months or to Time Serve. Base on the indictment in count 2 of the indictment. No Drugs. (See Indictment).

Alxleotold Gordon
Reg. No.: 55344-039
F.C.I. Texarkana
P.O.BOX 7000
Texarkana, TX 75505-7000

SHREVEPORT LA 710 DECEIVENE 2025 PM 2 L

Meoteld Gordon 55344-639

PEderal Correction Intotion

P.O. Box 7000

Texanthana, TX 75505

CLERK'S OFFICE DETROIT

Federal Building 526 WAter Street

Port HURON, M: 48060

48060-54999

իվակոկոկոկորդուրդուկիրուկորդություն